

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: November 15, 2010
Received: November 06, 2010
Status: Posted
Posted: November 15, 2010
Tracking No. 80b833f4
Comments Due: November 08, 2010
Submission Type: Web

Docket: EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736

Draft Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load

Comment On: EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0001

Clean Water Act Section 303(d): Notice for the Public Review of the Draft Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the Chesapeake Bay

Document: EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0640

Anonymous public comment

Submitter Information

General Comment

Traditionally, our methods of managing our soil, air, and water resources have not considered practices that are sustainable over the long term. Instead, we have relied upon and taught practices that create enormous unintended consequences.

Many of these consequences show up in our waterways, and the Chesapeake Bay is a shining example of numerous short-sighted practices.

Shifting people's thinking away from beliefs such as "It's the economy or it's the environment, but it's not both," is enormously important.

People also remember the command and control regulatory approaches that brought results for point-source pollution, but were often not the best long-term strategies - and were frequently so exorbitantly expensive that businesses were bankrupted. At the same time, the importance of clean air, water, and land was not a consistent message that entered our social consciousness.

Especially during difficult economic times, those who are profiting from creating untreated or marginally treated point or non-source pollution will fight very hard to make the case that jobs or taxes will be lost if any manner of "environmental" regulations are implemented. Being in the midst of the worst economic downturn since the 1930s, and following on the heels of the recent election, it is safe to say that there will be significant push-back to implementing regulations that would protect the Bay, the Gulf of Mexico, and every other waterbody in the nation.

However, if we as a society can be convinced that Hot Pockets or light

beer are things we should buy in quantity, or that people like Glenn Beck are in command of any accurate facts, then surely a clever advertising campaign can be developed to persuade Americans that protecting the quality of what we breathe, eat, and drink is a very good idea. Surely the advantages of low-impact development practices and sustainable agricultural practices can be highlighted to the point they become the normal technical and performance standards.

There is no question that keeping our air, our water supplies, and our food supplies free from pollutants is vital to our health and well-being and our national security. There is no question that when people believe their greatest interest lies in sustainable resources, then they will expect adequate protections. And there is equally no question that when people believe their greatest interest lies in exploiting and squandering resources, then they will do exactly that or they will support those who do.

Please address these problems at their sources - the way we think.